DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 130 938 SO 009 512

AUTHOR Morse, Stanley J.
TITLE National Identity from a Social Psychological Perspective: Two Brazilian Case Studies.
PUB DATE 76
NOTE 30p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Activism; Association (Psychological); Authoritarianism; Behavior Patterns; *Case Studies; Cultural Awareness; Developing Nations; *Identification (Psychological); *Nationalism; Political Attitudes; Psychological Patterns; Psychology; Role Perception; Self Concept; Socialization; *Social Psychology; Social Science Research; Surveys
IDENTIFIERS *Brazil; Brazil (Belem); Brazil (Sao Paulo)

ABSTRACT

Four aspects of national identity are investigated that seem relevant to an understanding of the complex sociopsychological ties which bind individuals to the nation-state. The four aspects of national identity are self-identity, consciousness of national identity, perception of nation-state, and citizenship role within nation-state. Two parallel case studies of national identity in Brazil were performed to investigate the four aspects. A questionnaire was administered to 178 undergraduates at the Universidade de Sao Paulo in Sao Paulo and to 193 undergraduates at the Universidade Federal do Para in Belem. Findings indicated that Belem respondents appear to place more emphasis on nationality than the Sao Paulo respondents. How strongly a person in Sao Paulo identifies with the nation-state has implications for how politically active one is likely to be and how one is likely to perceive Brazilian society. In contrast, in Belem identification with the nation-state is a more general phenomenon, thus revealing little about the individual's perceptions and behavioral dispositions. The difference may exist because national identity in Belem seems to assume a religious, other-worldly cast or because people in Belem simply are further removed from detailed information about Brazilian society and from channels of political change. It was concluded that, although further research must be done, psychological survey research techniques are useful for examining national identity. (Author/ND)

**********
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available. *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
**********

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED130938

Stanley J. Morse

# NATIONAL IDENTITY FROM A SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE: TWO BRAZILIAN CASE STUDIES*

All nation-states bring together within the framework of a single political system people who differ in socio-economic background, in political attitudes and in many other ways. The stability of a nation-state and the ease with which it can mobilize its members for collective pursuits therefore depends in part upon the establishment of an overriding sense of common national identity. Despite their differences, in other words, citizens must identify with the nation-state as a whole. A key question, then, is: How are individuals "tied" psychologically to the nation-state and thereby to one another?

## Psychological Approaches to National Identity

According to H.D. Forbes psychologists have adopted two very different approaches to this issue--the "personality" approach and the "socialization" approach.[1] An examination of the studies Forbes places into each of these categories shows that they differ not so much in terms of whether personality needs or socialization processes are stressed but rather that those in the "personality" camp are concerned with extreme, chauvanistic, almost pathological, forms of attachment to the nation-state, whereas "socialization" studies focus on a package of less intense, less all-embracing and less exclusive attitudes and perceptions. Actually the "socialization" studies are interested in a much more pervasive and thus much more important form of nationalism than the "personality" studies. Everyone, after all,

SP009512

has certain feelings about his or her nation. It is these feelings which must be understood. Knowing what makes a tiny minority "authoritarian"[2] or why some individuals may want others to control their lives[3] tells us little if anything about the psychological dynamics of national identity.

Leonard Doob[4] and Daniel Katz and Herbert Kelman and their co-workers[5] have probably done the most extensive work on national identity within the "socialization" tradition. Doob explains feelings of nationalism and patriotism as generalizations of what he regards as universal conditioned attachments to one's land, people and culture. The Katz-Kelman group, in contrast, adopts a "systems theory" approach, trying to specify the "locus" of an individual's attachment to the nation-state. In this group's most recent statement, for instance, John DeLamater isolates four types of commitment to the political system--symbolic, normative, ideological and functional.[6] The symbolically-committed respond positively to traditional national symbols such as the flag and national anthem whereas the ideologically-committed resonate to the ideology they see the political system as embodying. Normatively-committed persons are integrated into the system because they regard its norms and sanctions as legitimate. And, finally, the functionally-committed are integrated by means of the rewards they obtain from performing system-linked roles.

National Identity in Newly-Established Nation-States

There are, of course, many different ways in which national identity may be conceptualized and investigated. In a recent paper on national integration in Ghana and Kenya, for example, Roberta McKown focuses on

three distinct aspects of national identity, which she terms political loyalty, sense of civic responsibility and interpersonal identification with other citizens.[7] Political loyalty deals with the extent to which the individual identifies with the nation-state as a whole rather than with sub-national units to which he may belong (e.g. his tribe). Civic responsibility, in contrast, denotes the individual's sense of responsibility toward and expectations concerning the central government. Finally, interpersonal identification concerns the individual's perceptions of the desirability and utility of associating with members of other groups within the nation-state (for example, with members of other tribes). These three facets of national identity seem relevant in newly-created states containing distinct tribal or ethnic groups. The overriding question here is the extent to which the forces linking the individual to the nation-state are powerful enough to counteract those pulling him away from the nation-state and toward competing, lower-level forms of identification.

National Identity in Relatively Homogeneous Nation-States

In long-established, relatively homogeneous nation-states different issues come to the fore. We can assume that a sense of common national identity is widespread. However, being an Australian, an Italian or whatever may still mean different things to different people. But let's concentrate more specifically on national identity in one particular country--in Brazil. Despite a great deal of racial, economic and regional differentiation Brazilian culture is impressively homogeneous.[8] Brazilians thus share a strong, widely-

diffused identification with the nation as a whole. Within this sort of context it seems useful to examine four conceptually distinct but possibly interrelated aspects of national identity.

Self-Identity. First of all, even though tribal or ethnic groups which can compete with the nation-state for the individual's loyalty may not exist in Brazil some people quite obviously should identify more strongly with the nation-state than others. This can be investigated in the abstract. In the present study, for instance, people were simply asked: "How much does being a Brazilian mean to you?" It must be realized, however, that nationality is only one possible peg on which to hang self-identity.[9] People might think of themselves in terms of their social class background, their sex and so on. A key question is: How salient a form of self-identification is national identity in comparison with other complementary or competing forms of self-identification?

Factors Affecting Consciousness of National Identity. For everyone--no matter how strongly he or she may identify in general with the nation-state--national identity waxes and wanes over time. People undoubtedly identify more strongly with the nation-state when their country is at war than they do during peace time for instance. This, of course, is an extreme example. How might more common, everyday experiences affect a person's conscious of his or her nationality? Katz and Kelman's analysis[10] suggests that different national symbols may heighten awareness of national identity for different types of persons. Symbolically-committed individuals, they claim, respond positively when they see the flag, while ideologically-committed persons are relatively unaffected by this experience. They become

more conscious of their nationality when they are exposed to symbols which remind them of the philosophy or ideology on which they believe the political system is based. Pertinent data are provided in a study which Stanley Morse and Stanton Peele conducted of participants in an anti-Vietnam War demonstration in the U.S.[11] As expected, these authors found that demonstrators responded much more positively toward such symbols as "The Bill of Rights" (an ideologically-tinged symbol) than toward more traditional, emotionally-conditioned symbols such as the flag and national anthem.

Perceptions of the Nation-State. But with what precisely do different individuals within a nation-state identify? Two people might well identify equally strongly with the nation-state but have very different ideas about its character (especially if they live in different parts of the country or belong to different ethnic groups). John Johnstone found, for example, that English-speaking and French-speaking Canadians perceived their country quite differently.[12] French Canadians placed more stress than English Canadians on its division into different provinces. Perceptions of structural divisions can be investigated in two different ways. First of all, to what extent do people believe that competing groups within the nation-state have much in common simply because they are of the same nationality? And, secondly, how much conflict are various internal divisions believed to generate? In Brazil, for example, some people might see economic cleavages as very disruptive while others might stress cultural cleavages.

Role Within the Nation-State. So far we have dealt with the affective (self-identification) and cognitive (perceptions of the nation-state components of national identity. A behavioural component

can also be distinguished. What role do individuals believe a citizen should play in the nation-state? Here we are dealing with what Katz, Kelman and their colleagues call the "national role." The demonstrators studied by Morse and Peele viewed the national role, not surprisingly, in very activistic terms. They endorsed the idea that in order to be a good citizen a person should play an active role in the political process. Most people, on the other hand, probably adopt a more withdrawn approach to citizenship, one which centers around traditional notions of "patriotism." Similar orientational differences emerge clearly in Gabriel Almond and Sidney Verba's study of The Civic Culture.[13]

## The Present Study

The present paper presents two parallel "case studies" of national identity in Brazil. An especially-designed questionnaire was administered in Portuguese to 178 undergraduates at the Universidade de São Paulo (in the city of São Paulo) and to 193 undergraduates at the Universidade Federal do Pará, in Belém.[14] These two samples are similar in terms of age, sex and other demographic characteristics. Since the Universidade de São Paulo, furthermore, is supported by the state government and the Universidade Federal do Pará by the federal government the two universities draw their students from more or less equivalent socio-economic backgrounds. The Universidade de São Paulo, however, is located in the largest, fastest-growing, most industrialized and most cosmopolitan city in Brazil while the Universidade Federal do Pará is situated in the poor, rather isolated, Amazon region of the country. In geographical terms, then, these are two very distinct samples which might be expected to view the nation quite differently.

Respondents in Belém, for example, may adopt a more traditional, patriotic, symbolically-oriented type of commitment to the nation-state and those in São Paulo a more detached, critical, activist orientation.[15]

Strength of National Identity

How strongly, first of all, do members of each sample identify with Brazil? This issue was approached in two different ways. As mentioned, respondents were first asked the straightforward question: "In general, how much would you say being a Brazilian means to you? How much, in other words, do you care about being a Brazilian?" Five response categories were provided going from "it means nothing to me" to "it means a great deal to me." In Belém 92.1% of the respondents said that being a Brazilian means either "a great deal" or "a moderate amount." Only 64.4% of the respondents in São Paulo answered the question in this way.

But national identity is only one form of self-identity. Respondents were therefore given the list of self-identity items shown in Table 1 and were asked to rate "how central or important" each form of self-identity is "in terms of your overall view of yourself." Ten-point scales were used for this purpose, with 1 meaning

---

Insert Table 1 about here

---

"not important at all" and 10 meaning "extremely important." The items are listed in the order in which they appeared on the questionnaire. Two items may not be familiar. "Seu ambiente familiar," which is translated as "your family role," refers to the individual's role or functions within the family. "Seu nivel cultural," which appears

here as "your cultural level," reflects the fact that Brazilians see their society as divided into "cultured" and "uncultured" groups. In any case, we can ask two key questions of these ratings: Where does nationality fit in order of importance? And, how do respondents see the connection between their nationality and other forms of self-identity?

As far as the first question is concerned, in Belém nationality again seems to assume more importance than in São Paulo. In Belém it is rated as fourth in importance (8.95). It follows items which deal with the individual's immediate environment--your family role (9.57), your cultural level (9.30) and the fact that you're a student (9.22). In São Paulo, in contrast, nationality is seventh in importance (5.45), behind various socio-economic indicators--your cultural level (8192), the fact that you're a student (8.56), your family role (8.43), your sex (7.02), your occupation (6.56) and your social class (6.35). These results suggest that not only might different amounts of importance be attached to nationality in each city but nationality may also have a different psychological meaning for each set of respondents.

To explore this possibility the self-identity ratings made in each city were separately subjected to a Varimax rotation factor analysis, using Kaiser's criterion to determine the number of factors to be extracted. A minimum loading of .40 was used to assign an item to a particular factor. A factor analysis indicates how the ratings "cluster" or "hang together." In Belém, interestingly enough, nationality (.55) loaded on the same factor as religion (.55).[16]

No other items loaded on this particular factor. In São Paulo nationality (.65) also loaded on a factor with only one other item. Here, however, this other item was the region of the country the person is from (.52). These results seem to suggest, then, that in Belém nationality has religious overtones whereas in São Paulo it is simply a form of geographically-based self-identification. If this supposition is true, different experiences should have the power of heightening consciousness of nationality in the two places. Belém respondents, that is, should respond more strongly than those in São Paulo to emotionally-conditioned symbols such as the flag and national anthem. São Paulo respondents may, on the other hand, respond more strongly to more intellectualized reminders that they are Brazilians.

Experiences Affecting Consciousness of Nationality

To explore this issue respondents were told "We'd like to find out how various things affect how conscious you are of your nationality or affect the extent, in other words, to which you identify with Brazil (not with the government--but with Brazil and its people!)." Again 10-point rating scales were used, running from "not at all" (1) to "extremely so" (10). A not-applicable response was also provided in case respondents had never encountered one of the experiences listed in Table 2. Here too these items appear in the order in which they were printed on the questionnaire.

Insert Table 2 about here

As predicted, traditional, emotionally-conditioned symbols of nationhood have the greatest impact in Belém while in São Paulo intellectually-oriented items are given more weight. Thus in Belém the three most important consciousness-raising experiences are hearing Brazil's national anthem (9.20), seeing the Brazilian flag (8.55) and voting in elections (8.39). In São Paulo contacts with foreigners and fellow nationals are rated as most important--probably because such experiences make respondents realize both the uniqueness of Brazilian culture and its internal homogeneity. The three highest ratings are given to travelling to different parts of Brazil (7.43), speaking with foreigners visiting Brazil (7.09) and visiting foreign countries (7.07). Hearing Brazil being criticized by foreigners (6.86) is in fourth place. A cultural rather than symbolic emphasis appears parmount. Hearing Brazilian music (6.66) is rated as next in terms of its impact followed by reading Brazilian literature (6.38). An emphasis on politics also appears in São Paulo but not in Belém. São Paulo respondents, for instance, rated following political news in the newspapers (6.37) as seventh in importance. In Belém this item was in last place (6.51). Given these differences, do Belém and São Paulo respondents also see their nation and their role within it differently?

Perceptions of Societal Divisions

To begin, to what extent do respondents believe that because members of two groups share the same nationality this overrides structurally-induced differences between them? Respondents were asked, for example, how much rich people and poor people in Brazil have in common and also how much rich people in Brazil have in common with

rich people elsewhere. If nationality is believed to override economic differences they should say that rich people in Brazil have more in common with poor people in Brazil than with rich people in other countries. Respondents compared these and other pairs of groups using 10-point scales going from "have very little in common" (1) to "have a great deal in common" (10). They were told that having a great deal in common means that the two groups are "not really very different from each other in terms of attitudes, styles of living, etc."

---

Insert Table 3 about here

---

Respondents compared the following groups: white people in Brazil and people of other colours in Brazil, white people in Brazil and white people in other countries, rich people in Brazil and poor people in Brazil, rich people in Brazil and rich people in other countries, immigrants to Brazil and native-born Brazilians, immigrants to Brazil and people in the countries from which they came, students in Brazil and other people in Brazil and students in Brazil and students in other countries. These comparisons were made in a scrambled order. To simplify data presentation the amount two groups within Brazil are believed to have in common (for example rich people in Brazil and poor people in Brazil) has been used as a baseline. From this has been subtracted the amount a group in Brazil is believed to have in common with similar groups in other countries (for example rich people in Brazil and rich people in other countries). The figures in the first line of Table 3 were obtained, for instance, by subtracting the amount white people in Brazil have in common with white people in other countries from the amount white people in Brazil have in common with people of other colours in Brazil. A higher score in each case thus indicates the extent to which being Brazilian overrides internal

As these results show, in both São Paulo and Belém sharing a common nationality is believed to override racial differences within the country (although not by a large margin). For these racial or "colour" comparisons São Paulo respondents produce a score of .97 and Belém respondents one of .82. Nationality, however, does not override differences between rich and poor Brazilians and between immigrants and native-born Brazilians. This is especially true in the case of the rich-poor distinction: -5.42 in São Paulo and -3.29 in Belém. While respondents in São Paulo and Belém share common perceptions here there are some distinct differences. The rich-poor split is seen as deeper in São Paulo (-5.42) than in Belém (-3.29) and São Paulo and Belém respondents disagree about the amount students and non-students within the country have in common compared with the amount students in Brazil have in common with students in other nations. In São Paulo this latter comparison produces a score of -.70 and in Belém one of 1.11. Even more importantly, São Paulo respondents see Brazil as less homogeneous overall than Belém respondents. If we compute the mean "difference score" over all the comparisons, in São Paulo we find a score of -1.54 and in Belém -.55.

If they see their society differently, do these two groups of respondents also attach different amounts of importance to various divisions within their nation? To study this issue respondents were asked to indicate the importance of the divisions shown (as printed on the questionnaire) in Table 4. Again 10-point scales were used, running from 1 ("not important at all") to 10 ("extremely important"). Each division was rated "in terms of its consequences

Insert Table 4 about here

or impact upon Brazilian society at the present time." The questionnaire explained that "a division would be considered important if it generates political conflict, if the different groups mentioned have very different social attitudes, etc."

These ratings show more agreement than do the similarity ratings just reviewed. Economic-related divisions are judged as most important by each sample. The three highest ratings are given by São Paulo respondents to rich vs. poor (8.76), workers vs. employers (8.16) and illiterates vs. people who are not illiterate (8.15). For Belém the three top places go to illiterates vs. people who are not illiterate (7.77), people with different cultural levels (7.33) and workers vs. employers (6.89). Certain divisions, though, are evaluated differently in each location. For example, the division between the federal and state governments is considered the least important division in São Paulo (4.85) but fourth in importance in Belém (6.87). This may reflect the fact that many Brazilians believe that the federal government represents and is controlled by elements in the industrialized south of the country; people in the north and north-east are shortchanged.

A factor analysis done on each set of ratings reveals that respondents in São Paulo see economic divisions as distinct from other types of divisions. In Belém respondents do not make such a clearcut distinction between different types of internal cleavages. Thus in São Paulo the workers vs. employers (.90) and rich vs. poor (.66) divisions share a factor by themselves. These two divisions, in other words, are differentiated from related cultural divisions. Different

cultural levels (.59), illiterates vs. people who are not illiterate (.57), students vs. non-students (.55) and immigrants vs. native-born Brazilians (.44) load together on a separate factor. In sharp contrast, in Belém economic divisions are linked with economically-related geographical divisions. Appearing on one factor are the divisions between workers and employers (.74), rich and poor (.66), whites and non-whites (.62), urban and rural areas (.60) and the north-east and the rest of Brazil (.49). This is further evidence that respondents in each area see the country as a whole from their own unique vantage point. In the isolated, underdeveloped and relatively powerless Amazon region (Belém), that is, respondents seem more aware of the economic ramifications of the division between different parts of the country, between rural and urban areas and between different racial groups than is true in powerful, industrialized São Paulo.

Citizenship Requirements

It might be expected that the somewhat different perceptions of Brazil and different feelings about nationality which we found in Belém compared with São Paulo might be associated with different conceptions of the role which a citizen should play within the nation-state. "Different people have very different ideas about what a person needs to do in order to be a good citizen," respondents were told. They were thus asked, "What do you think it's necessary to do in order to be a good citizen?" Respondents evaluated the importance of each of the behaviours listed on Table 5, using scales running from "not important at all" (1) to "extremely important." (10). They appeared on the questionnaire in the same order as on the table. As expected,

respondents in São P Ao do endorse a more critical, more activist

Insert Table 5 about here

role for citizens than do those in Belém. This difference is marked. In São Paulo the behaviour rated as most important in terms of being a good citizen is be critical in approach to public issues (7.81). This is followed by be informed about current events (7.81) and work to change government policies with which disagree (7.06). Be patriotic is in position seven (4.24). In Belém, on the other hand, the three most important items are be law-abiding (9.27), be patriotic (8.57) and be informed about current events (7.92).

For both samples three factors emerged when these citizenship ratings were subjected to factor analyses. The first embraces traditional notions of patriotic behavior and the second a more critical, activist approach. In São Paulo Factor I included volunteer to fight in wars in which the country is involved (.66), avoid criticizing the country in front of foreigners (.59), always support government policy (.53), be patriotic (.52) and, interestingly enough, be religious (.48). In Belém Factor I consisted of be patriotic (.61), be law-abiding (.59), invest money in ways which will benefit the country (.42) and volunteer to fight in wars in which the country is involved (.41). A close inspection suggests that although Factor I (the Traditional Patriotism Factor) contains the same key elements in each city patrotism has a somewhat different meaning in São Paulo and in Belém. In São Paulo being patriotic involves <u>not</u> being critical, whereas in Belém it doesn't seem to have this implication (although, of course, it doesn't involve <u>being</u> critical either).

The second, or Activism, factor shows more similarity across the two samples. In São Paulo it embraces be critical in approach to public issues (.72), work to change policies with which disagree (.71), be informed about current events (.62) and be involved (.57). In Belém it contains be informed about current events (.63), work to change policies with which disagree (.57) and be critical in approach to public issues (.56). (The Third Factor for each sample contains a hodge-podge of miscelaneous items which we needn't consider here.)

Inter-relationships Between Different Aspects of National Identity

Further insight into national identity may be gained by examining inter-correlations between the various aspects of national identity we have been investigating. A key question is: Are affective, cognitive and behavioural components of national identity associated in the same way in São Paulo as in Belém?

To investigate this issue we can return to the factor structures which emerged when the self-identification ratings, the ratings of the importance of the various divisions, the ratings of the various requirements for good citizenship and the ratings of the impact of various experience upon consciousness of nationality were subjected to factor analyses. As far as the self-identification items are concerned, we can concentrate on the factor on which "the fact that you're a Brazilian" loaded significantly. This will be called the "National Identity" (NI) factor. Each respondent was assigned a factor score on this factor.[17] The same procedure was followed for the two main factors which emerged from the analysis of the requirements for good citizenship--The Traditional Patriotism Factor (TP) and the

Activism Factor (A). Finally, as far as the experiences which might heighten consciousness of nationality are concerned, we are mainly concerned with the "Traditional Symbols" (TS) factor, the factor on which reactions to such items as the flag and national anthem loaded highest.

In general, respondents in both cities who scored high on the National Identity (NI) factor also scored high on both the Traditional Symbols (TS) and Traditional Patriotism (TP) factors. This means that individuals for whom national identity is a very important form of self-identification also respond positively to traditional symbols and endorse a view of citizenship stressing traditional forms of patriotic behaviour. In São Paulo, for example, the correlation between NI and TS was .47 and between NI and TP .33.[18] In Belém NI and TS correlated .55 and NI and TP .36. While not very strong, these correlations do reveal clearcut links between these various aspects of national identity.

But key differences between São Paulo and Belém are also apparent. Perhaps most interestingly, in São Paulo NI also correlated positively with responses to the remaining consciousness-raising items whereas in Belém it did not. This suggests that in São Paulo a very wide range of experiences makes people who identify strongly with the nation-state more aware of their nationality. Such people in Belém respond with heightened awareness only to traditional symbols. Strong identification with the nation-state may consequently have a very different, more limited, more emotionally-charged meaning in Belém than in São Paulo.

This difference emerges in a quite different way when correlates of scores on the two citizenship factors are examined. As mentioned, in both cities individuals who identify more strongly with Brazil also stress Traditional Patriotism when they describe how a good citizen should behave. In São Paulo this means that individuals with high NI scores make a clear distinction between Traditional Patriotism and Activism; they opt for the former. (NI in São Paulo is uncorrelated with A.) In Belém, on the other hand, there is a positive correlation not only between NI and TP but between NI and A as well (.33). Identifying strongly with the nation-state in Belém may lead to the endorsement of either citizenship approach, in other words.

But let's examine the São Paulo data more closely. São Paulo respondents who endorse an Activist type of citizenship emphasize the importance of Economic Divisions (ED) within the country. The correlation between A and this Economic Divisions factor is .20. Those who endorse a Traditional Patriotism stance instead (the two are negatively correlated: -.24) minimize such divisions, producing a correlation of -.18 between TP and ED. In Belém these various items are unrelated.

What this seems to mean is that how strongly one identifies with the nation-state has implications in São Paulo for how politically active one is likely to be and how one is likely to perceive Brazilian society. In Belém strong vs. weak identification with the nation-state is a more isolated phenomenon which reveals little about the individual's perceptions and behavioural dispositions. As just suggested, this may be because in Belém but not in São Paulo national identity seems to

assume a religious, other-worldly cast. Or it may simply be because people in Belém are further removed than those in São Paulo from both detailed information about the state of Brazilian society and from channels which might be used to bring about political change.[19]

## Conclusion

In this paper we distinguished four aspects of national identity which seem relevant to an understanding of the complex psychological ties which bind individuals to the nation-state. Dealing first with the affective component of national identity, we investigated how strongly respondents in São Paulo and in Belém identify with Brazil and how important nationality is to them in terms of their overall views of themselves. Along both dimensions the Belém respondents appear to place more stress on nationality than the São Paulo respondents. Even more importantly, nationality seems to have a somewhat different meaning in each place, with religious overtones in Belém and more concrete, geographical overtones in São Paulo. This difference in orientation also appeared when we examined the experiences which respondents said made them more aware of being Brazilians.

Exposure to traditional symbols of nationhood such as the flag and national anthem were most important in Belém. In São Paulo, on the other hand, more intellectualized experiences--particularly contacts with foreigners and fellow nationals--heightened consciousness of nationality. This difference, of course, has interesting implications as far as mobilizing people for collective action is concerned. To mobilize individuals in Belém (or possibly in the northeast of Brazil or in less industrialized areas in general) traditional symbols and

religious rites might be most effective whereas how to mobilize individuals in São Paulo (or possibly in industrialized areas in general) is more problematic. One cannot count on their simply responding positively to emotionally-conditioned emblems of nationhood. Intellectual argument will probably have to be used to "sell" these individuals on a course of action in the national interest.

Turning next to cognitive or perceptual aspects of national identity we found that the nation-state may be perceived quite differently by different groups of citizens although, of course, its "objective" structure will produce a good deal of consensus in impressions of the nation. Belém respondents placed less stress than those in São Paulo on economic cleavages within Brazil and also saw the nation as generally less fragmented. Belém respondents seem to have generalized about the country as a whole from the way it appears in the Amazon region or perhaps in the underdeveloped regions of Brazil in general. São Paulo respondents may have generalized as well, but from a different perspective.

These affective and cognitive differences also manifested themselves in behavioural terms. With a more critical view of Brazil, respondents in São Paulo endorsed a view of citizenship stressing political activism. Those in Belém endorsed a view of citizenship stressing a non-involved form of traditional patriotism. But the link between citizenship conceptions and the other components of national identity appears somewhat different in each area. In São Paulo those who identify strongly with the nation-state see it rather positively, respond to a wide range of symbols and opt for the patriotic citizenship role. Those who identify less strongly with the nation-state see it less positively, are unaffected by most types of consciousness-raising symbols and stress political activism. While the data at hand do not allow us to impute

causality to these relationships it might be suggested that those who, for whatever reason, adopt a more detached, less-emotionally charged outlook on the nation-state tend to stress its faults and to want to remedy them, if possible, through political action. But what causes this detachment in the first place? The São Paulo data provide a hint that a lack of strong emotional ties in childhood may produce this sort of approach. Respondents were asked how well they got along with their parents as children and also how attached they feel to their hometown. Those who reported worse relations with their parents and less attachment to their hometown were precisely those who identified least strongly with Brazil, were most critical of it and were most oriented toward political action. In Belém, however, the pattern was less clearcut, primarily because the two distinct citizenship roles--the Traditional Patriotism one and the Activism one--were apparently not seen as mutually incompatible.

We have undoubtedly just engaged in a speculative exercise which takes us way beyond the available data. The two "case studies" we have presented do nevertheless clearly suggest hypotheses which may be investigated more systematically in the future. A technique which appears to be useful in this endeavor has also been outlined. Most work on nationalism has been conducted by historians and political scientists who have focused on the institutional level of analysis. Implicit in this research is the idea that for nationalistic movements to be successful and for national integration to proceed efficiently individuals must identify strongly with the nation-state. As demonstrated, survey research techniques can be used to supplement these analyses by examining national identity from the point of view of the individuals who make up a nation-state.

Notes

*I would like to thank Dante Moreira Leite, Gilberto Labate and Sonia Labate for helping to collect the data from São Paulo reported in this paper and Ivo Freitas for helping to collect the data from Belém.

1. H.D. Forbes, "Two Approaches to the Psychology of Nationalism," Canadian Review of Studies in Nationalism, 2 (1974), 172-181.
2. This issue is examined in T.W. Adorno, Else Frenkel-Brunswick, D.J. Levinson and R.N. Sanford, The Authoritarian Personality (New York, 1950).
3. See Erich Fromm, Escape from Freedom (New York, 1941).
4. Leonard W. Doob, Patriotism and Nationalism (New Haven, 1964).
5. See, for example, Daniel Katz, "Nationalism and Strategies of International Conflict Resolution," in Herbert C. Kelman, ed., International Behavior (New York, 1965), 356-390, Daniel Katz, Herbert C. Kelman and Richard Flacks, "The National Role," Peace Research Society Papers, 1 (1964), 113-127 and John DeLamater, Daniel Katz and Herbert C. Kelman, "On the Nature of National Involvement: A Preliminary Study of an American Community," Journal of Conflict Resolution, 13 (1969), 320-357.
6. John DeLamater, The Study of Political Commitment (Washington, 1973).
7. Roberta E. McKown, "National Integration in Africa: Measurements and Correlates in Ghana and Kenya," Canadian Review of Studies in Nationalism," 3 (1975), 45-69.
8. For a general introduction to Brazilian culture see Charles Wagley, An Introduction to Brazil (New York, 1973).

9. See, for example Chad Gordon, "Self-conceptions: Configurations of content," in Chad Gordon and Kenneth J. Gergen, eds., The Self in Social Interaction (New York, 1968), 115-136.

10. See note 5.

11. Stanley J. Morse and Stanton Peele, "A Study of Participants in an Anti-Vietnam War Demonstration," Journal of Social Issues, 27 (1971), 113-136.

12. John C. Johnstone, Yong People's Images of Canadian Society (Ottawa, 1969).

13. Gabriel A. Almond and Sidney Verba, The Civic Culture: Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five Nations, (Boston, 1965).

14. This study is part of a continuing series of cross-national investigations. So far data has been collected in South Africa, Canada, New Zealand and Zambia as well as in Brazil. Canadian results are summarized in an unpublished paper by the present author: "Being a Canadian" Aspects of National Identity among a Sample of University Students in Saskatchewan." The São Paulo study is described more fully in another unpublished paper: "The Individual and the Nation-State: A Social Psychological Perspective."

15. This hypothesis was suggested by a reading of the research by the Katz-Kelman group which stresses that individuals in less sophisticated, less economically developed areas should be more likely than others to adopt a symbolic type of commitment to the nation-state.

16. The numbers in parentheses indicate factor loadings. These are similar to correlation coefficients. The higher an item loads on a particular factor the more closely it is associated with the other items on the same factor, taken as a whole.

17. Respondents received a single score on each factor. This score is a weighted average considering not only the items which loaded above .40 on a given factor but all the items rated as part of each question. Those items with the highest loading on a given factor, however, received the most weight in computing factor scores.

18. All correlations reported are significant at the .05 level or better according to two-tailed tests of statistical significance.

19. In line with this it should be observed that respondents in São Paulo received a significantly higher score than those in Belém on a test of political knowledge included in the questionnaire. It should also be noted that São Paulo students are, in general, more politically-active than their counterparts in Belém. Impressionistic evidence suggests furthermore that police and military units are more visible in Belém than in Sao Paulo.

20. A questionnaire which can be used in research of this sort is available from the author, who is interested in collaborative research in other countries. Write to: Dr. Stanley J. Morse, School of Social Sciences, The Flinders University of South Australia, Bedford Park, S.A. 5042, Australia.

Table 1

Question: How central or important is each of these things in terms of your overall view of yourself?

| | São Paulo | Belém |
|---|---|---|
| a. your sex | 7.02 | 8.76 |
| b. your nationality (being a Brazilian) | 5.45 | 8.95 |
| c. your religion | 4.07 | 5.76 |
| d. your social class | 6.35 | 6.61 |
| e. your colour | 3.80 | 3.82 |
| f. the fact that you're a student | 8.56 | 9.22 |
| g. the region of the country you're from | 5.05 | 7.25 |
| h. where your ancestors are from | 3.74 | 4.72 |
| i. whether you're married or not | 4.46 | 5.26 |
| j. your cultural level | 8.92 | 9.30 |
| k. your family role | 8.43 | 9.57 |
| l. your occupation (if you have a job) | 6.56 | 7.23 |

Table 2

Question: To what extent does each of these things make you more conscious of being a Brazilian?

| | São Paulo | Belém |
|---|---|---|
| a. visiting foreign countries | 7.07 | 7.11 |
| b. hearing Brazil's national anthem | 4.74 | 9.20 |
| c. voting in national elections | 3.99 | 8.39 |
| d. seeing the Brazilian flag | 4.00 | 8.55 |
| e. seeing a display of Brazilian military equipment | 2.53 | 7.06 |
| f. reading about Brazilian history | 5.86 | 8.15 |
| g. hearing a speech by the President on radio or watching it on TV | 3.18 | 6.98 |
| h. hearing Brazil being criticized by foreigners | 6.86 | 8.09 |
| i. celebrating national holidays such as September 7th | 2.53 | 7.40 |
| j. following political news in the newspapers | 6.37 | 6.51 |
| k. travelling to different parts of Brazil | 7.43 | 7.97 |
| l. speaking with foreigners visiting Brazil | 7.09 | 7.59 |
| m. when Brazilian teams defeat teams from other countries in athletic contests | 5.77 | 8.24 |
| n. hearing Brazilian music | 6.66 | 7.70 |
| o. taking part in "Carnival" | 4.49 | 6.94 |
| p. reading Brazilian literature | 6.38 | 7.32 |

Table 3

Question: How much do these groups have in common?

| | São Paulo | Belém |
|---|---|---|
| white people in Brazil and people of other colours in Brazil/white people in Brazil and white people in other countries | .97 | .82 |
| rich people in Brazil and poor people in Brazil/rich people in Brazil and rich people in other countries | -5.42 | -3.29 |
| immigrants to Brazil and people born in Brazil/immigrants to Brazil and people in the countries from which they came | -.99 | -.85 |
| students in Brazil and other people in Brazil/students in Brazil and students in other countries | -.70 | 1.11 |

Table 4

Question: How important are these divisions in Brazil?

| | São Paulo | Belém |
|---|---|---|
| a. men vs. women | 6.06 | 5.92 |
| b. rich people vs. poor people | 8.76 | 6.56 |
| c. white people vs. people of other colours | 5.89 | 4.05 |
| d. workers vs. employers | 8.16 | 6.89 |
| e. people in urban areas vs. people in rural areas | 7.34 | 6.20 |
| f. the northeast vs. the rest of the country | 8.10 | 5.94 |
| g. immigrants to Brazil vs. people born in Brazil | 5.20 | 5.67 |
| h. the federal government vs. the state governments | 4.85 | 6.87 |
| i. students vs. other people | 6.67 | 5.95 |
| j. people with different cultural levels | 7.46 | 7.33 |
| k. people with different political ideologies | 7.63 | 6.69 |
| l. the military vs. civilians | 8.03 | 6.65 |
| m. illiterates vs. people who are not illiterate | 8.15 | 7.77 |
| n. young people vs. old people | 5.94 | 6.20 |

Table 5

Question: In order to be a good citizen how important is it for a person to...

| | São Paulo | Belém |
|---|---|---|
| a. be law-abiding | 6.73 | 9.27 |
| b. be patriotic | 4.24 | 8.57 |
| c. be critical in approach to public issues | 7.81 | 6.17 |
| d. always support government policies even though might work to change them | 2.24 | 5.15 |
| e. invest money in ways that will benefit the country | 5.15 | 6.76 |
| f. be informed about current events | 7.81 | 7.92 |
| g. refrain from criticizing the country in front of foreigners | 3.73 | 7.34 |
| h. be involved in political activities | 5.20 | 4.10 |
| i. work to change government policies with which disagree | 7.06 | 5.86 |
| j. volunteer to fight in wars in which country is involved | 3.28 | 6.95 |
| k. attend church or other religious services regularly | 1.93 | 4.74 |